DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 130 425 95 EA 008 810

TITLE	Training for Leadership in Local Educational Improvement Programs. Unit 1. Training Program Introduction and General Study Plan Guide.
INSTITUTION	Research for Better Schools, Inc., Philadelphia, Pa.
SPONS AGENCY	National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
BUREAU NO	RT-3-0001
PUB DATE	75
CONTRACT	NE-8-00-3-0001
NOTE	49p.; For related documents, see EA 008 809-819
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Administrative Personnel; *Educational Improvement; *Educational Objectives; Elementary Secondary Education; Instructional Programs; *Leadership Training; *Study Guides

ABSTRACT

This is one unit of a ten-unit program offering training for leadership in selecting, planning, and conducting any sort of educational improvement program in a school or school system. The present unit gives an introduction to the training program by presenting the five study objectives and describes the General Study Plan Guide to the student's work on the remaining units. The five objectives are listed and illustrate general types of local educational improvement programs, identify and describe common shortcomings in local educational improvement programs, identify and describe positions calling for a specialty in local educational improvement, outline general qualifications for a local educational improvement specialty, and outline needs for training in a local educational improvement specialty. The General Study Plan Guide gives brief descriptions of units 2-10, then gives a procedure for the student, with or without an instructor's assistance, to develop a personal plan for studying any of these units. In each unit selected for study, the student will use the Unit Study Plan Guide in arriving at a specific plan for study. (Author/IRT)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED130425

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

TRAINING FOR LEADERSHIP IN LOCAL EDUCATIONAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

UNIT 1. TRAINING PROGRAM INTRODUCTION and GENERAL STUDY PLAN GUIDE

Project Director: Glen Heathers

Research for Better Schools
1700 Market Street
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Robert G. Scanlon
Executive Director

1975

EA 008 810

Published by RESEARCH FOR BETTER SCHOOLS, INC., a private nonprofit corporation. The opinions expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the National Institute of Education, and no official endorsement by the National Institute of Education should be inferred.

The work on which this publication is based was performed pursuant to Contract NE 8 - 00 - 3 - 0001, Project RT 3-0001 with the National Institute of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The development of these training materials began in 1970 under a grant from the Research Training Branch of the U. S. Office of Education (Contract OEC-1D-70-4771, Project RT-D-9043) made to the Learning Research and Development Center, University of Pittsburgh. The initial version of the materials was used in a six-week training program given 12 educational leaders, six employed by the Pennsylvania Department of Instruction, three by Research for Better Schools, and three by school systems in Pennsylvania. In addition, these materials were employed in 1971-72 with seven students in a special doctoral program in the Department of Curriculum and Supervision at the University of Pittsburgh.

In January 1973, the development activities were moved to Research for Better Schools and supported by a new grant from the National Institute of Education (Contract NEB-00-3-0001, Project RT 3-0001).

At Pittsburgh, project staff members playing chief roles in developing the training materials were Lawrence Michalak, Theodora St. Lawrence, and Todd Simonds. At Research for Better Schools, staff roles in materials development have been held by Mary Brown, Carolyn Clark, Lucretia Floor, James Johnson, John McAdams, and Beverly Loy Taylor.

Tests of prototype versions of some program units have been made at Intermediate Unit 13 of the Pennsylvania Department of Public Instruction, the Rhode Island Department of Education, the Illinois State Education Department, and Open University in St. Louis.

Consultants who have provided valuable critiques of prototype versions of training units have been John Bolvin and Robert Perloff of the University of Pittsburgh; Janice Baker and Charles Mojkowski of the Rhode Island Department of Education; William Gephart of Phi Delta Kappa; Shirley McCune of the National Education Association; and Richard Gibboney of the R. A. Gibboney Associates.

At the U. S. Office of Education and National Institute of Education, program officers have been John Egermeier and Susan Klein.

CONTENTS

Purposes and Nature of the Training Program

This program of 10 units offers training for leadership in selecting, planning, and conducting any sort of educational improvement program of a school or school system. The improvement program could have the purpose of improving existing features of a school system or introducing changes in the system.

The training program is meant for anyone in education whose position involves leadership in any sort of educational improvement program, or who is preparing for a position calling for such leadership.

The topics covered by Units 2-10 of this training program are listed below. Descriptions of these units are given later in this unit as part of the General Study Plan Guide (pages 36-41).

Unit 2. Theory and Strategies for Local Educational Improvement

Unit 3. Task Flow for Designing and Conducting Local Educational Improvement Programs

Unit 4. Individualization, Mastery, and Student Self-Direction as Themes of Educational Reform, with Related Innovations

Unit 5. Enquiry as a Theme of Educational Reform, with Related Innovations

Unit 6. Personal/Social Development as a Theme of Educational Reform, with Related Innovations

Unit 7. Relevance as a Theme of Educational Reform, with Related Innovations

Unit 8. Selecting a Local Educational Improvement Program

Unit 9. Analyzing and Improving the Implementation of a Local Educational Program

Unit 10. Diffusing Educational Improvement Programs within a School System

The training program has been designed so that it can be studied on an individual basis, with each unit in a form that permits independent study. All students should do Unit 1 (including the General Study Plan Guide) and should study any or all of the remaining nine units depending on needs, interests, and time available. Each of Units 2-10 can be studied profitably without studying the other units. However, it is expected that most students will select two or more units. For example, a student concerned with improving the individualization of instruction could select Unit 4 and one or more of Units 2, 3, 8, 9, and 10, depending on the position held and current needs of the school system.

The training materials can be used in various ways. University professors could use any or all of the units as assigned or elective components of courses in administration or supervision. The units could be used in workshops for field personnel of state education departments, or for administrators and supervisors in school systems. The units could also be studied on an individual basis by anyone in a role of educational leadership, either as general preparation for such leadership, or as a guide to immediate work in a particular educational improvement program. To add to the practicality of using the units, each has been built to require no more than one or two days of study.

Outline of Unit 1

The present unit, requiring only a few hours of study, gives an introduction to the training program consisting of five study objectives, followed by a General Study Plan Guide to the student's work on the remaining units. The five objectives offer a general review of educational improvement programs, a survey of positions calling for leadership in

school improvement, an examination of qualifications for such leadership, and a discussion of current needs for training such as this program offers. These are the topics of the five objectives:

Objective 1. List and Illustrate General Types of Local Educational Improvement Programs

Objective 2. Identify and Describe Common Shortcomings in Local Educational Improvement Programs

Objective 3. Identify and Describe Positions Calling for a Specialty in Local Educational Improvement

Objective 4. Outline General Qualifications for a Local Educational Improvement Specialty

Objective 5. Outline Needs for Training in a Local Educational Improvement Specialty

The General Study Plan Guide gives brief descriptions of Units 2-10, then gives a procedure for the student, with or without an instructor's assistance, to develop a personal plan for studying any of these units. In each unit selected for study, the student will use the Unit Study Plan Guide in arriving at a specific plan for study of that unit. In determining how a unit is to be studied, performing a unit pre-assessment exercise will provide information on what study is needed. Following study of the unit, a post-assessment exercise will check mastery of the unit's objectives. (In studying this introductory unit, no pre- and post-assessment exercises are included.)

Objective 1. List and illustrate general types of local educational improvement programs

A local educational improvement program is any planned program (or project) designed either to improve the instruction offered students or to improve any aspect of a school system outside its instructional program. The first of these purposes could be illustrated by a program changing instruction in a curriculum area while the latter could be illustrated by a program intended to improve staff morale or community relations. Note that an improvement program could have the purpose of strengthening what is already being done in the school system, or it could introduce some change into the system as by adopting an innovation to replace some current aspect of the system.

Exercise 1

In Exercise 1, try your hand at listing and illustrating different types of local educational improvement programs. The worksheet for this exercise is on the next page. The word type refers to general aspects of a school system within which various improvement programs could be conducted. Very often, improvement programs involve introducing changes and most of your illustrations may be of this sort. However, you may think of illustrations that do not introduce changes but seek rather to improve the implementation of existing features of the system.

WHen you complete the worksheet, spending no more than 5 or 10 minutes on the exercise, study the following material that lists and illustrates 10 types of improvement programs, noting any types that you may have missed in your list. It is very unlikely that you will have the same list of types of programs as the list of 10 that is given. Studying the list of 10 should simply help you round out your list.

EXERCISE 1 - WORKSHEET

Types of Local Change Programs

Directions: List below as many types of local educational improvement programs as you can think of quickly, and illustrate each type. Take only 5 or 10 minutes for this exercise. When you complete it, study the following pages that call attention to 10 types of such programs.

TYPE OF IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	ILLUSTRATION

The following is a list of 10 types of local educational improvement programs to use in checking your answer to Exercise 1. It is not expected that your list of types of programs given in Exercise 1 will include all 10 types listed below. Doubtless you have offered your own way of classifying improvement programs, perhaps using broader or narrower groupings than those given below. Very likely you thought of one or more types of programs that are not covered by the list of 10. The purpose of the exercise is simply to help you think through the various sorts of improvement programs. There is no one right answer to the exercise since there is no official list of types of local educational improvement programs.

Most improvement programs introduce changes from existing practices. However, many improvement programs, rather than introducing changes, are designed to improve the effectiveness of existing practices.

There is no standard classification of local educational improvement programs. However, a useful list of types of such programs can be made by surveying the components of an instructional program and surveying also the various conditions or factors that can contribute to strengthening an instructional program. Improvement programs can involve any of these components, conditions, or factors, taken singly or in combination.

The list given below covers the great majority of local improvement programs. It often happens that one program includes features of several of the types listed; in such cases, the program can best be placed under the type that identifies its chief purpose. For example, changing the curriculum in elementary mathematics may call for associated changes in learning equipment, staff assignments, and in-service teacher education. The program should, however, be listed under curriculum improvement. The

first type of program listed--introducing a new instructional system--includes changes in numerous components and conditions of instruction (curriculum, organization for instruction, staff assignments, staff training, etc.). However, because of its inclusiveness, such a change program merits a special category in the list of types of improvement programs.

Under each of the 10 types of improvement programs, you are invited to write in one or more illustrations of your own.

1. Introducing a new instructional system. This type of improvement program introduces relatively inclusive and inter-related changes in an entire instructional program, or in the ways instruction is conducted.

Good examples of instructional systems are several innovative programs for individualizing instruction: Individually Prescribed Instruction (IPI) originated at the University of Pittsburgh; Program for Learning in Accordance With Needs (PLAN) developed by the American Institutes for Research and the Westinghouse Learning Corporation; Individually Guided Education (IGE) developed by the Wisconsin Research and Development Center for Cognitive Learning; the "multi-phasic" plan for the nongraded high school developed by B. Frank Brown at Melbourne, Florida; and the "open-classroom" approach to the elementary school developed in Britain.

Your illustration: _____

_____

2. Introducing a program to serve a special purpose or special student group. This type of program is similar to the one beginning this list except that it introduces a sub-system within the total instructional system. Within

its special orbit; it introduces a whole set of inter-related changes (in curriculum, staffing, etc.).

Illustrations are an honors program in the high school; an advanced placement program in the high school; a foreign language program in the elementary school; a Head Start or Follow Through program; and setting up a special class for emotionally disturbed children.

Your illustration: _____

_____

3. Changing the curriculum in one or more instructional areas. This very frequent sort of improvement program involves usually adopting one of the many innovative curricula developed during the past decades. True, a school system can create its own curriculum. This, however, is uncommon since most school systems lack the expert personnel, the time, and the money required to build a curriculum rather than adopting one built elsewhere.

Examples of curricula that many school systems have adopted are these: The PSSC Physics course for the high school developed by the Physical Science Study Committee; BSCS Biology developed by the Biological Sciences Curriculum Study; Science--A Process Approach (SAPA) developed for the elementary school by the American Association for the Advancement of Science; and Man: A Course of Study (MACOS) created by the Educational Development Center in Massachusetts.

In addition to adoptions of innovative curricula, some curriculum improvement programs involve merely shifting to a different text series, or putting together a modified curriculum making use of materials drawn from two or more published curricula.

Your illustration: _____

_____

4. Introducing new learning equipment. As a means of improving instruction, a school system can adopt new learning equipment in one or more curriculum areas.

Examples of equipment adoptions are: audiotape recorders; filmstrips and film loops; Polaroid cameras; overhead projectors; computer facilities for computer-aided instruction; dial selection systems to deliver audiotapes or videotapes; and teaching machines for presenting programed learning materials.

Your illustration: _____

_____

5. Introducing new learning facilities (changes in school plant). A major area of educational innovation during the past quarter-century has been in educational facilities. The prime mover in this area has been the Educational Facilities Laboratory established in New York City by the Ford Foundation with leadership from Harold Gores.

Illustrations of the sorts of changes in facilities that have been introduced in many school systems are these: converting loft buildings for school use; modernizing the interiors of old school buildings to provide more flexible uses of space; building open plan school buildings with large learning spaces lacking partitions; creating space flexibility through moveable partitions; replacing conventional school libraries with learning resources centers; and employing campus plans for large centralized school facilities.

Your illustration: _____

_____

6. Introducing a new in-service staff training program. Because of the critical needs for improving the competencies of personnel, most school systems regularly design and conduct in-service staff training programs. Most such programs are of limited value because of hasty planning, the lack of adequate instructional staffing, and limited commitment of staff members participating in them. (Many times, in-service teacher workshops are a part of local adoptions of new curricula; such in-service education should be treated as a part of curriculum change programs.)

Examples of local improvement programs in in-service education are these: summer institutes in planning and conducting individualized instruction; sensitivity training institutes for teachers; programs to prepare teachers to work with inner-city children; and workshops for teachers on evaluating instructional outcomes.

Your illustration: _____

_____

7. Introducing a new pattern for organizing instruction. Instructional organization includes provisions made for articulating the various components of the instructional program. Local change programs can introduce modifications in school schedules, student schedules, teachers' assignments and schedules, staff specialists' assignments and schedules, student grouping, or inter-school divisions of instruction (as in 8-4, 6-2-4, 6-3-3, or 4-4-4 plans for dividing the school years into elementary, intermediate, and high school levels).

Numerous new organizational plans for schools have been developed during the past two or three decades. Illustrations are: nongraded plans for elementary and secondary schools; cooperative (team) teaching plans;

departmentalized plans for elementary schools; house plans for secondary schools; and schools without walls in urban centers.

Your illustration: _____

_____

8. Introducing a new program of interpersonal or intergroup relations. Particularly during recent years, interpersonal and intergroup conflicts involving different cultural subgroups in the school population (blacks vs. whites, Puerto-Ricans vs. blacks or whites, or Chicanos vs. whites) have given impetus to local change programs seeking to deal with such problems. In addition, the growing concern among educators for the affective goals of education (involving such purposes as enhancing the student's self-concept, developing positive interpersonal attitudes, and fostering cooperative intergroup relationships) has stimulated the introduction of local change programs in this general area.

Examples of such improvement programs, excluding sensitivity training for teachers or similar staff training programs, are these: staff-student committees in high schools for working out solutions to interpersonal or intergroup conflicts; programs to increase students' participation in decisions about curricular, co-curricular, or extra-curricular activities at school; and courses in secondary schools dealing with such subjects as personal development, intergroup relations, and Black Studies.

Your illustration: _____

_____

9. Introducing a new program in school/community relations. In recent years, the community served by a school or school system has become increasingly

involved in decisions about the content, conduct, and management of the instructional program. The Civil Rights Revolution has had much to do with this, with special concerns expressed by the community about the relevance and quality of instruction offered inner-city children, especially children of minority groups. Increasing costs of schools have been a major source of community concerns and actions. Concerns about the effectiveness of schools have given rise to pressures to make the schools accountable in terms of instructional outcomes in relation to costs.

Illustrative local change programs of this type are: school system decentralization in New York City and other metropolitan centers, in which the participation of community members is stressed; educational programs of community action agencies such as the Urban League, the NAACP, and Model Cities; the setting up of community-controlled alternative schools; and activities of organized community groups in inner cities in pressing their demands on local school boards.

Your illustration: _____

_____

10. Introducing a new program in school administration or finance. Obviously, when community groups assume direct control of public schools, or when they set up alternative schools, school administration and finance are changed. However, major changes in administration and finance can occur within a school system without being mainly a result of community pressures.

Examples of changes of this type are: shifting from an appointive to an elective school board; conducting bond drives to build new school facilities; adding key administrative or specialist staff positions such as

assistant superintendent in charge of instruction, elementary or secondary supervisors, assistant principals, or school psychologists; or introducing a new system of cost-accounting or accountability within the school district.

Your illustration: _____

_____

If you turn to the literature on local educational improvement programs, you will not find any review covering all of the types of programs described above. The following references are useful surveys of one or more types of innovations that have been adopted in numerous local change programs.

Commission on Educational Technology. To Improve Learning. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1970.

Educational Facilities Laboratories. Transformation of the Schoolhouse. 1969 Annual Report. New York City.

Goodlad, John I. (ed). The Changing American School. 65th Yearbook of the NSSE, Part II. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1966.

Goodlad, John I. The Changing School Curriculum. New York: Ford Foundation, 1966.

Guggenheim, Fred, and Guggenheim, Corinne L. New Frontiers in Education. New York: Grune & Stratton, 1966 (General)

Heathers, Glen, "School Organization: Nongrading, Dual Progress and Team Teaching." Chapter V in Goodlad (ed), The Changing American School.

Interchange. Special issue on School Innovation. Vol. 3, No. 2, 1972. Published by the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, Toronto. (General)

Miller, Richard I. Perspectives on Educational Change. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1967. (General)

National Elementary Principal. Special Issue on Innovations in Instruction. Vol. 43, No. 1, 1963. (General)

National Elementary Principal. Special Issue on Cooperative Teaching. Vol. 44, No. 3, 1965.

Objective 2. Identify and describe common shortcomings of local educational improvement programs.

In your role of leadership in strengthening education, one important way to recognize the challenges you face is to become aware of the common shortcomings of local improvement programs. Such shortcomings have resulted in the failure of many change programs to achieve their objectives and their being abandoned prematurely.

The faults of improvement programs may lie in the lack of an adequate analysis of needs for improvement, in a poor choice of change program, in inadequate implementation of the program chosen, in a failure to evaluate program outcomes, or in a failure to spread changes throughout the school system following a successful pilot test.

Such faults have been documented in a number of studies of different sorts of improvement programs. Faults in need analysis and the design of change programs have been identified in a national survey of projects funded under Title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Richard I. Miller, director of the survey summarized the weaknesses found in hundreds of project proposals:

> ...inadequate definition of the needs in most of the proposals is a glaring weakness....The 'needs' inadequacies are directly related to lack of clear objectives...The proposals, as a whole, are inadequate in evaluation...Lack of dissemination and implementation provisions is another obvious inadequacy.

("An Appraisal of ESEA Title III." Theory into Practice, 1967, 6, 116-119.)

Other studies will be cited in the discussion following Exercise 2.

In Exercise 2 (next page) you are invited to review the shortcomings of a local improvement program familiar to you, or to point out different weaknesses you have noted in different change programs.

EXERCISE 2 - WORKSHEET

Weaknesses in Local Change Programs

Directions: From your knowledge of local change programs, describe weaknesses you have noted under any or all of the four headings below. Indicate the type of change program in each case. If you refer to only one program, write "Same" opposite "Type of change program" under the later headings.

FAULTY CHANGE PROGRAM DESIGN (Poor choice of changes to meet local needs, inadequate plans for putting the changes into effect, etc.)

Type of change program: _____

Faults noted: _____

_____

_____

_____

FAULTY IMPLEMENTATION OF THE CHANGE PROGRAM

Type of change program: _____

Faults noted: _____

_____

_____

_____

LACK OF ADEQUATE EVALUATION OF OUTCOMES

Type of change program: _____

Faults noted: _____

_____

_____

_____

FAILURE TO SPREAD A SUCCESSFUL PILOT PROGRAM THROUGHOUT THE SCHOOL DISTRICT

Type of change program: _____

Faults noted: _____

_____

_____

_____

The following discussion of frequent shortcomings of local educational improvement programs will help you check and round out your answers to Exercise 2.

Faulty Change Program Design

In many school systems, the choice of an improvement program, and the plan for putting it in operation, both leave much to be desired. This always reflects a lack of the needed leadership, either of expertness in selecting and planning the improvement program or of administrative support, or both.

Two illustrations of faulty program choice are the following: A school system with a predominantly inner-city student population, few of whose students are college-bound, selected for adoption the high school course in physics developed by the Physical Sciences Study Committee (PSSC physics). The course seeks to teach students theory and methods in physics that are best suited to students with strong academic interests. Also, the reading level of the course materials is above that of most high school students of an inner-city population. Failure of this change program could be expected. Another school system, desiring to individualize the teaching of reading and mathematics in the elementary school, selected a nongraded program for reorganizing instruction in these subjects. But the program selected for adoption called for sorting students into homogeneous classes of students having about the same level of advancement in these subjects. Teachers would teach these classes with mainly whole-class methods that involve little attention to the individual needs of students. Again, failure of the program to achieve the intended results could be predicted with confidence.

Once an improvement program has been chosen, it very often happens that the plans made to put it in operation are inadequate. This is particularly apt to be true with regard to the selection and training of the personnel assigned to implement the program. In the case of the PSSC physics program, few high school science teachers know modern theory and methods of physics well enough to teach the new course effectively. Also, plans for installing the program in the school district referred to did not provide for the in-service teacher education and supervision that would be needed by the teachers. In the case of the school system that selected the nongraded program, it also was true that implementation plans did not include intensive teacher education in the philosophy and methods of advancing individual students on a nongraded basis within the program's framework.

Faulty Implementation of Change Programs

Recently, the very frequent failure of improvement programs to achieve the intended outcomes has been seen as the result, not of a poor choice of program, but of faulty program implementation. Studies of degree of implementation of individualized programs such as Individually Prescribed Instruction (IPI) have revealed great differences in the degree to which different teachers followed the procedures called for. The same has been true with studies of implementation of cooperative teaching programs, nongraded plans, and open classroom plans. (Inadequate provisions in the plans made for teacher selection, training, and supervision could account for these shortcomings.)

One published study of faulty implementation found that an organizational plan for the elementary school had been implemented at the structural level (new schedules, student grouping, and teacher assignments) but not at the

procedural level (individual rates of progress, testing students for mastery of learning tasks, etc.). The structural features of the plan could be placed in effect by merely administrative arrangements. The procedural features required intensive staff training and supervision that was not provided. (Reference: Heathers, Glen. Organizing Schools Through the Dual Progress Plan. Danville, Illinois: Interstate, 1967. Chapter 8.)

Another study of faulty implementation involved a change program in a city elementary school serving minority-group students. Teachers were called upon to introduce such changes as building learning tasks around children's interests, encouraging children to teach one another, and allowing the children to direct their own learning activities. Their failure to do these things rather than doing conventional teaching was shown to result largely from the failure of school administrators to give teachers the needed orientation, training, and support. (Reference: Gross, Neal C., Joseph B. Giacquinta, and Marilyn Bernstein. Implementing Organizational Innovations. New York: Basic Books, 1971.)

Lack of Adequate Evaluation in Improvement Programs

Evaluation is an area of weakness in the great majority of local educational improvement programs, doubtless because the training of school system personnel in methods of evaluation is grossly inadequate. Leaders of improvement programs, if they lack expertness in evaluation, need to understand the nature of evaluation well enough to seek help from experts in the field.

Different types of improvement programs require different sorts of evaluation measures. Programs designed to improve instruction call for

measures of achievement of learning goals of different types (facts, ideas, skills, etc.), as well as for measures of student attitudes toward the new program as compared with the old. Programs designed to improve staff morale, or school/community relations, or interpersonal relations of students at school, require particular kinds of measures of attitudes and behavior.

Studies of improvement programs have revealed the common tendency to treat evaluation almost as an afterthought in conducting the programs. Yet, if careful evaluations are not made, school system leaders have no secure basis for deciding whether or not a program is succeeding, or whether it is sufficiently successful to merit spreading it throughout the school district.

Actually, change program evaluation needs to include more than measuring outcomes. Identifying and assessing local needs for improvements is one form of evaluation. Assessing the change program chosen in terms of the probability that it will meet local needs is another. Assessing the implementation of the program is another critical form of program evaluation. The reason for its importance is clear: if a program is not effectively implemented, what reason is there to expect that it will produce the intended outcomes? A fourth type of evaluation is measuring program outcomes.

Evidence on the failure of local improvement programs to provide adequately for evaluation is given by Egon Guba in his analysis of 32 Title III proposals from 19 states. Only 19 of the proposals called for any kind of local needs analysis. Many of the proposals referred to lists of needs prepared elsewhere without provisions for determining whether they applied locally. In 29 of the 32 proposals, no analysis was offered of

the probability that the program chosen would meet local needs through its provisions. Only one of the proposals contained any plans for assessing level of implementation of the program. In this single instance, the purpose given for assessing implementation was to help other schools implement a similar program, rather than to ensure that local implementation was successful. Most of the proposals contained some provisions for evaluating program outcomes. However, the best of these called for "weak product evaluations utilizing only the most obvious indices such as pupil achievement." (Reference: "Evaluation and the Process of Change." In Catalyst for Change: A National Study of ESEA Title III (PACE). Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1967.)

Failures to Spread Successful Programs, District-Wide

It is common practice to introduce local improvement programs in just a few classes, or in one school. It is well recognized that it is the exception, rather than the rule, for a program that has proven successful in a pilot test to spread into schools throughout the district. Often this is due to a lack of funds, particularly when the pilot test was funded from outside sources. But many times this failure to spread the adoption of a program results from a lack of support from the central leadership, or from resistance of the staffs of schools to adopt a program that they identify with the school or schools where it was pilot tested.

The discussion just given of faults of improvement programs provides one basis for examining job requirements in different positions of leadership in local educational change, and the qualifications a person needs to possess to meet those requirements.

Objective 3. Identify and describe positions calling for a specialty in local educational improvement programs

There are relatively few positions in education that call for full-time involvement in educational improvement programs. However, many thousands of educators hold positions requiring them to spend a significant proportion of time in planning and conducting local change programs. A local educational improvement specialty is called for in any position requiring, say 25 per cent or more of the time to be spent on local educational change programs. In most instances such a specialty is a regular component of the job. In some instances, responsibilities for leadership in a change program is a temporary assignment--as when a teacher is placed on a project team charged with planning and conducting some improvement program.

There are a dozen or more types of educational organizations or agencies with staff positions calling for a local educational improvement specialty, as listed below.

Public or parochial school systems

Private or community schools

Correspondence schools

Business, industry, government, and the military (with training programs)

Private foundations (with educational grant programs)

State education departments

Educational information centers

U.S. Office of Education

National Institute of Education

Regional educational laboratories or R&D centers

Private educational R&D or consulting firms

University departments or centers

Note that the first four types on the list are sites of local educational programs. Some staff members in each such agency have responsibilities for leadership in improvement programs. The use of outside consultants or experts in designing and conducting local improvement programs is very common. Agencies of types 5-12 on the list are sources of such assistance. This is particularly true of state education departments, private consulting firms, and university departments or centers.

School System Specialties in Improving Instruction

Within a school system, responsibilities for leadership in improvement programs is an important part of the jobs held by administrators, coordinators, and specialists working at the system or building level. School systems of different sizes and serving different student populations differ greatly in the names of positions within their tables of organization and in the responsibilities assigned to those positions. The positions described below are representative of most public school systems in urban or suburban districts. In smaller districts, or in private schools, the functions related to improving instruction are concentrated in fewer positions.

Office of the superintendent. The school superintendent, with approval of the school board, has over-all responsibility for the selection, planning, and conduct of educational improvement programs. These responsibilities usually are shared with associate or assistant superintendents for administration or instruction in the larger school systems. The following list of change-related functions has been abstracted from job descriptions for Superintendent of Schools and Associate Superintendent for Instruction of one large school system. Almost all of the items on the list appeared

in both job descriptions.

- Recommend objectives, goals, programs, and priorities to guide the work of the school system

- Keep abreast of new knowledge and experience in education

- Identify requirements of the school system for curriculum, programs, personnel, and other resources in support of instruction

- Lead in long-range and short-range planning of the curriculum and instructional programs

- Establish and direct programs to assist principals and teachers in improving the effectiveness of instruction

- Develop sound and effective school organization at all levels

- Identify requirements and recommend staffing for central administration

- Provide for effective programs of in-service training of unit heads, principals, and other central administration personnel

- Develop and coordinate needed programs of in-service teacher education

- Evaluate the performance of unit heads and ensure sound evaluation of principals, coordinators, and teachers

- Appraise progress toward the attainment of the educational objectives of the school system

- Plan and conduct a comprehensive program for providing information and interpreting the work of the schools to the public

Curriculum coordinator (or department head). In most school districts, specific responsibilities for leadership in improving instruction in a curriculum area are assigned to a district-wide curriculum coordinator or department head in that area. The following list of functions is taken from the job description of a district mathematics coordinator.

- Keep informed of significant developments in the field of mathematics education and relate them to subject content and instructional methods

- Identify requirements for improvements in mathematics instruction and lead the development of revised courses of study, materials, and methods

- Develop and lead a program of in-service training of teachers in mathematics

- Lead in developing appropriate subject-related activities in mathematics

- Evaluate teacher performance and student achievement in mathematics

Building principal. A critical role in developing and conducting educational improvement programs is performed by the building principal since change programs in instruction always must be implemented at the building level, even when they are planned elsewhere in the school system. The following functions related to instructional improvement are taken from a job description of the building principal.

> Keep informed of significant developments and innovations related to the school's instructional program
>
> Lead in developing and implementing improvements in curriculum, instructional practices, or school organization
>
> Develop and supervise in-service training programs for teachers
>
> Participate in evaluating the implementation and outcomes of improvement programs

The three types of school system leadership positions singled out for attention are usually the most critical ones for the design and conduct of local improvement programs, though other positions frequently provide vital leadership. This frequently is true of the director of pupil personnel services, the director of research or evaluation, or a staff member assigned as director of a particular change program. It is important to note that numerous staff members ordinarily share the leadership functions involved in an improvement program through being members of a team representing administration, curriculum, and instruction.

Local Educational Improvement Specialties in State Education Departments

Outside school systems, field personnel of state education departments play key leadership roles in initiating, designing, conducting, and evaluating local change programs in school districts, either as members of the department's office at the state capitol or as members of a county or intermediate unit of the department.

Mathematics consultant in a state education department. The following local improvement functions are from the job description of a curriculum specialist working out of the central office of a state education department. Comparable change-related functions are performed by department specialists of other curriculum areas.

Serve as an advisor and resource person on mathematics education to staffs of school systems

Plan and develop curriculum materials in mathematics such as course outlines, study guides, and outlines for math films and audio-visual aids

Assist school district personnel in evaluating new teaching methods and instructional equipment

Demonstrate to school system personnel the use of laboratory equipment to facilitate mathematics instruction

Disseminate curriculum materials to local school officials through conferences, workshops, correspondence, and publications

Organize and conduct in-service training for mathematics teachers

Field specialist of an intermediate unit of a state education department. Most state education departments maintain county or intermediate units each serving a geographic area within the state. The position whose functions are listed below is that of a field consultant of an intermediate unit who offers help to school systems in any area or level of instruction.

Design and conduct workshops for school system leadership

Develop in-service training programs for elementary and secondary teachers

Assume operational responsibilities for some change programs of school systems

Provide advice on curriculum development for special education programs

Serve as advisor and consultant to elementary and secondary principals, counselors, and training specialists

Plan, organize, and assist in elementary and secondary evaluation studies of school districts

A Specialty in School Improvement at an Education Information Center

A number of states contain an education information center linked both with the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) of the U. S. Office of Education and with the state education department. The chief function of the centers is to provide school systems with information about new developments in education. The following list of functions is taken from the job description of an information specialist of one of the centers.

Assist school systems in assessing educational needs and setting priorities for improvement programs

Oemonstrate innovative educational practices to school system personnel

Provide support services to local districts in needs assessment, program design, and dissemination strategies

Assist school districts in obtaining and interpreting information needed to initiate and evaluate new practices

Assist in program/project planning and writing

Assist local districts in attracting and using existing federal, state, and local funds

Identify specialists who can assist in special areas of curriculum, instruction, or administration

Conduct literature searches for school districts

Assist in planning and conducting local in-service training programs

Local Educational Improvement Specialties in Other Types of Agencies

Many positions calling for a specialty in local educational change are found in private educational consulting firms, regional educational laboratories, university departments, and other types of educational agencies. Any of the functions listed for the positions described on the preceding pages can be performed by personnel of these types of agencies serving in the roles of consultants to school systems or of project personnel engaged in developing and testing educational innovations in school systems.

Exercise 3

Exercise 3 asks you to examine your present job, or jobs you would like to hold in the future, in terms of the responsibilities for leadership in local improvement programs that those jobs involve.

Thinking through the positions in various types of agencies that are described above in terms of their relation to your career should make this objective more meaningful to you, perhaps by helping you clarify your needs to prepare yourself to perform certain types of leadership functions.

Turn now to the next page and perform Exercise 3. Since this is a personal exercise, there is no answer key for it.

EXERCISE 3 - WORKSHEET

Personal Jobs and Functions in Local Educational Changes

Directions: To relate Objective 3 to the job you now hold, or to jobs you may hold in the future, respond to the list below, filling in the JOB column with N for the job you now hold and F for future jobs you would want to hold. Then list 5 or more key functions you perform, or would expect to perform, in a local educational improvement specialty within the job(s) you checked. (Reviewing the functions listed under the positions described on the preceding pages will help you make your list.)

TYPE OF EDUCATIONAL AGENCY	JOB	
School System:	____	Superintendent or Assoc. Sup't.
	____	Curriculum Coord. or Dep't Head
	____	Building Principal
	____	Other: _____
State Education Department:	____	General Field Consultant
	____	Curriculum Area Specialist
	____	Program Evaluator
	____	Other: _____
Education Information Center:	____	Information Specialist
Educ. Lab or R&D Center:	____	Field Consultant
	____	Project Director
Private Educational Firm:	____	Consultant to School Systems
University Faculty:	____	Consultant to School Systems

KEY FUNCTIONS IN LOCAL EDUCATIONAL CHANGE YOU PERFORM, OR WOULD PERFORM:

1. _____

_____

2. _____

_____

3. _____

_____

4. _____

_____

5. _____

Objective 4. Outline general qualifications for a local educational improvement specialty

Three general types of competency are essential for a specialty in leadership of local educational improvement programs. These are (1) knowledge of education and educational change, (2) skills in designing and conducting local educational improvement programs, and (3) competencies in interpersonal relations.

Knowledge About Education and Educational Change

A leader in local educational improvement programs should have a basic knowledge of the major aims or themes that underlie instructional programs, products, or procedures. For example, one should possess a working knowledge of individualized instruction, of student self-direction, and of mastery as a criterion of accomplishment of learning tasks. Likewise, by way of example, one should know what is meant by teaching ideas rather than facts, by teaching students competencies in problem solving, and by fostering positive self-concepts in students.

Also, the specialist in educational improvement should be competent in analyzing the relationships between major educational aims and the products or procedures that are intended to foster those aims in schools. For example, one should be familiar with various approaches to individualizing instruction such as nongrading, IPI, open classroom plans, or independent study programs.

Further, a leader of local improvement programs needs to know about the organization of school systems, their instructional programs, and their relations with the communities they serve.

Exercise 4 (next page) offers you the opportunity to check how familiar you are with various major developments that have been focal points of educational improvement programs during the past decade or two.

EXERCISE 4 - WORKSHEET

Checklist on Knowledge of Topics on Innovation

Directions: Every educator with a specialty in local educational improvement needs knowledge of a variety of topics and information on current practices and innovations. This checklist helps you to judge your knowledge of such topics and to identify topics you need to learn more about.

Please respond to the list of topics by checking those items about which you feel you lack sufficient knowledge to work effectively in change programs involving them. Then circle your check marks for those items you particularly would like to know more about.

____ racial integration	____ continuous progress plans
____ T-groups	____ differential staffing
____ community action organizations	____ open classrooms
____ contingency management	____ Black Studies
____ computer-aided instruction	____ programmed instruction
____ nongraded plans	____ sensitivity training
____ extended school year	____ affective goals
____ criterion referenced tests	____ accountability
____ mastery-referenced instruction	____ behavioral objectives
____ personal/social development	____ computer scheduling
____ honors programs	____ preschool programs
____ alternative schools	____ open plan school buildings
____ team teaching	____ voucher plans
____ drugs and education	____ student roles in decision making
____ instructional technology	____ Microteaching
____ community involvement in schools	____ individualized instruction
____ self-directed learning	____ simulation techniques
____ games in education	____ instructional TV
____ competency-based instruction	____ performance contracting

PLEASE ADD TOPICS YOU FEEL BELONG ON THIS LIST, AND CHECK THEM APPROPRIATELY.

____ _____	____ _____
____ _____	____ _____
____ _____	____ _____
____ _____	____ _____
____ _____	____ _____
____ _____	____ _____
____ _____	____ _____

In case you wish to improve your knowledge of certain of the topics listed in Exercise 4, a good way is to turn to recent issues of Education Index to locate key references in educational periodicals or books. All of these items will be found to be topics of articles or books published during the past few years. Journals such as Phi Delta Kappan, Educational Leadership, and Saturday Review (Education Supplement) are excellent sources of up-to-date summary articles on such topics as those listed.

Skills in Designing and Conducting Local Improvement Programs

Anyone having a specialty in leadership for local improvement programs needs expertness in the problem-solving processes required for designing and conducting such programs. This expertness relates to performing local needs analyses, surveying resources available for meeting the needs identified, evaluating local resources and constraints as they relate to undertaking different alternative improvement programs, designing the improvement program chosen, then conducting the program through the processes of implementation, evaluation, and local diffusion into other schools if it was initiated on a pilot basis in one or two schools. Being expert in employing such problem-solving processes does not necessarily mean that one must actually perform them. Rather, it may mean chiefly offering assistance to local personnel as they design and conduct their own improvement programs.

The problem-solving skills just referred to constitute the heart of the training offered in Units 2-10 of this training program. These units are briefly described later in this unit as part of the General Study Plan Guide.

Competencies in Interpersonal Relations

Leadership in local improvement programs always requires skills in working with others. To be effective in working with school system personnel, the leader must employ sound procedures of communication and of interpersonal or group processes. Always the leader must work within the limits set by the competencies and readinesses of local personnel. Often the role calls for skills in selecting and training individuals who will perform essential tasks in the design and conduct of change programs.

Training in interpersonal relations is not a formal part of this training program, though Unit 2 on the theory and strategies of local educational change contains some material related to this topic. Some excellent training materials for establishing such competencies have been developed by the Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory in Portland, Oregon under the title Interpersonal Communications.

A useful way for you to examine your competencies in interpersonal relations is to perform Exercise 5 (next page). This exercise is not a personality test but rather simply a checklist of some important aspects of interpersonal communications or relationships.

EXERCISE 5 - WORKSHEET

Checklist of Personal Competencies

Directions: Check one of the boxes opposite each item. Avoid undue modesty as well as avoiding the tendency to inflate your judgments in your favor.

COMPETENCY	THOROUGHLY COMPETENT	GENERALLY ADEQUATE	NEEDS IMPROVEMENT
1. Describing your ideas and feelings to others			
2. Being perceptive of group needs, opinions, and attitudes			
3. Being able to relate to people of different cultural groups			
4. Adapting to differences in others' roles			
5. Identifying non-verbal communication cues			
6. Eliciting confidence in others			
7. Putting others at ease			
8. Being an attentive listener			
9. Being objective in dealing with others' ideas and feelings			
10. Being flexible in dealing with others' ideas and feelings			
11. Exhibiting self-assurance in interacting with others			
12. Being tactful in handling disagreements			
13. Being sensitive to others' feelings and wishes			
14. Employing approval and praise whenever justified			
15. Offering support and help to others readily, as needed			

Objective 5. Outline needs for training in a local educational improvement specialty

Many thousands of educators hold positions calling on them to take leadership in the design and conduct of improvement programs in the nation's schools. Rarely have they received training for a specialty in providing such leadership. It is no surprise that there is an acute shortage of trained personnel in this field, and it is no surprise that most local improvement programs reveal the types of shortcomings reviewed under Objective 2 of this unit (pages 14-20).

Several major studies of educational personnel have highlighted needs for trained personnel to provide leadership for innovation in schools across the country. Three studies meriting special attention are those by Clark and Hopkins (1969); Gideonse (1969), and Chase (1968). All three studies found a serious lack of personnel having training suited to the requirements of current and prospective positions in the development, diffusion, and utilization of instructional innovations.

Sidney J. Marland, Jr., former U.S. Commissioner of Education and former Under Secretary for Education in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, stressed the importance of developing a "delivery system" to bring successful innovations into the nation's schools. He wrote: "Whatever sort of breakthrough we achieve in teaching and learning, it will be useless unless it is linked with a system for delivery that works." (1971, p. 577) Obviously, the delivery system he refers to depends on adequately trained personnel to provide the needed leadership for designing and conducting local educational improvement programs.

With respect to the adoption of innovations by school districts, Clark and Guba (1967) make this key recommendation concerning the needed leadership:

> Each district should identify internally or employ high-level personnel whose charge it is to serve as liaison between the district and outside change agencies, to mount and carry out demonstration and trial projects within the district, and to work with teachers and other personnel in the district who are engaged in installing and institutionalizing new programs and practices (p. 131).

This training program is directed specifically at providing the sort of training called for in the studies cited. If you wish, as part of your study of leadership for educational improvement, to consult any of these studies, the needed references are given below. Also, reference is made to the national study of Title III projects edited by Richard I. Miller.

References

Chase, Francis S. The National Program of Educational Laboratories: Report of a Study of Twenty Educational Laboratories and Nine University Research and Development Centers. Washington, D.C., U.S. Government Printing Office, December 1968.

Clark, David L., and Guba, Egon G. "An Examination of Potential Change Roles in Education." In: National Education Association, Center for the Study of Instruction, Rational Planning in Curriculum and Instruction: Eight Essays. Washington, D.C., NEA, 1201 16th Street, N.W., 1967.

Clark, David L., and Hopkins, John E. A Report on Educational Research, Development, and Diffusion Manpower, 1964-1974. Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Research Foundation, 1969.

Gideonse, Henrik O. Educational Research and Development in the United States. Washington, D.C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1970.

Marland, Sidney P., Jr. "A New Order of Educational Research and Development." Phi Delta Kappan, 1971; 52, 576-579.

Miller, Richard I. (Ed.) Notes and Working Papers Concerning the Administration of Programs Authorized under Title III of Public Law 89-10, The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1967.

GENERAL STUDY PLAN GUIDE

Procedure for Deciding Which Units You Will Study

The General Study Plan Guide offers you a procedure for deciding which of Units 2-10 of this training program you will study, and for setting up your plan for studying them. If you have an instructor for the training program (perhaps your job supervisor, or a workshop director), you and your instructor will work out your plan together.

The Guide calls on you to do three things: study the brief descriptions of Units 2-10, fill out the Personal Unit Analysis Form, and fill out the Personal Study Plan Form.

Descriptions of Units 2-10 of the Training Program

Read the following descriptions of 9 training units to gain an overall familiarity with the topics they cover. The sequence of the units is not important except for the fact that Units 2 and 3 present the most general material on theory, strategies, and procedures of local improvement program while Units 8, 9, and 10 deal with specific aspects of the local change process. Units 4-7 offer analyses of major themes or purposes underlying local improvement programs.

You will need to return to these descriptions when you proceed to the second part of the Guide to fill out the Personal Unit Analysis Form.

Unit 2. Theory and Strategies of Local Improvement Programs. This unit provides a general conceptual basis for selecting, designing, and conducting local educational improvement programs. The following are covered in the unit:

The relation of theory of educational change to planning and conducting the local improvement programs

Barriers to change in school systems: bureaucratic organization, negative attitudes of staff members, lack of needed resources, etc.

Forces favoring change: acute problems of the schools (dropouts, group conflict, drugs, etc.), community pressures, pressures from governmental agencies, information about educational innovations

Strategies for improvement programs: authoritarian vs participatory, product-centered vs need-centered, pilot vs total-system approaches, external vs internal leadership

Guidelines for effective leadership in local educational improvement: working within local readinesses, offering expert assistance, following rules for effective interpersonal relations and group processes

Ways of establishing local capabilities for leadership in planning and conducting improvement programs

Unit 3. Task Flow for Designing and Conducting Local Educational Improvement Programs. This unit presents a general problem-solving model and shows how to apply it to the design and conduct of improvement programs. Unit exercises are based on a detailed case study of the development and introduction of the program of a new intermediate school in a large urban community. The task flow covers the following general stages in educational improvement programs:

Identifying the area where improvement is needed

Assessing what needs to be changed in the area chosen

Identifying resources that could be put to work to meet the needs

Sizing up local factors, plus or minus, related to adopting resources that could meet the needs for improvement

Selecting the changes to be introduced in the improvement program

Blueprinting the improvement program

Installing the improvement program and assessing its implementation

Measuring outcomes of the improvement program

Deciding, on the basis of outcomes, whether to discontinue, continue, or spread adoption of the improvement program

Unit 4. Individualization, Mastery, and Student Self-Direction as Themes of Educational Reform, with Related Innovations. This unit deals with three major, and closely related, themes of today's educational reform movement, and examines the extent to which various recent innovations in instruction place these themes in operation. The unit covers the following:

What is individualization (or personalization) of instruction?

What is a teacher's model for individualization?

How, and to what extent, do these innovations provide for indivualization: ability grouping, nongrading, independent study, honors programs, indiyidually prescribed instruction (IPI), or the open classroom?

What is meant by mastery and how can every student achieve mastery?

What are the benefits from having all students master learning tasks?

What is student self-direction and how can it be achieved?

Why is student self-direction essential for individualizing instruction?

Unit 5. Enquiry as a Theme of Educational Reform, with Related Innovations. This unit deals with the theme that is at the heart of nearly all of the new curricula in science, mathematics, and social studies. Enquiry (often spelled inquiry) as a theme in instruction means that students learn to think, to solve problems, to be creative, to conduct projects in a curriculum area. Memorizing facts, or merely learning skills by rote, is no longer the emphasis. Topics covered in the unit include the following:

Why should instruction place emphasis on teaching all students to enquire?

How does understanding ideas help in conducting enquiries?

What are the steps or stages in conducting enquiry (problem solving)?

Methods of analyzing curricula in terms of provisions for enquiry

Methods of analyzing instruction in terms of provisions for enquiry

How to assist a school district in introducing enquiry instruction

Unit 6. Personal/Social Development as an Educational Theme, with Related Innovations. This unit deals with an area of educational change that has received immense attention during recent years, often under headings such as affective education, humanized education, or psychological education. Any educator with a specialty in local educational improvement needs to be acquainted with developments in this area. The unit topics include the following:

Why should schools place emphasis on students' personal/social development?

What is self-concept and how can instruction foster positive self-concepts?

What are faults of today's schools in relation to building positive self-concepts in slow learners, girls, and members of minority groups?

How can students' motivation to achieve be strengthened?

How can values be taught in school?

How can instruction improve interpersonal and intergroup relations?

How can the educator evaluate shortcomings of the instructional program in relation to students' personal/social development?

What are approaches to teacher education related to increasing their competencies in fostering students' sound personal/social development?

Unit 7. Relevance as an Educational Theme, with Related Innovations. A very recent theme in criticisms of the schools and in instructional innovations is relevance, a theme concerned with the extent to which the school program is appropriate for meeting the needs of different groups of students. Topics in this unit include these:

What is relevance, and how can one judge the relevance of a school program?

What are major lacks of relevance of school programs for students generally?

How do school programs fail to be relevant for girls?

How do schools lack relevance to the needs and cultural backgrounds of minority groups, especially Blacks?

How can student participation in decision making improve schools' relevance?

How can community participation increase the relevance of the schools to students' needs?

What are major changes in curriculum and instruction designed to make schools more relevant to the needs of students generally?

What changes in curriculum and instruction have been offered as ways of increasing their relevance for girls and minority-group students?

How have alternative schools, or alternative programs within schools, been designed to improve the relevance of school offerings?

How can the relevance of a school's program be measured?

Unit 8. Selecting a Local Educational Improvement Program. Sometimes the educator with a specialty in local improvement programs is called on to help a school or school system choose an improvement program. This unit focuses on this phase of the local change process that is covered less intensively in Unit 3 that covers also designing, conducting, and evaluating improvement programs. This unit deals with the problem solving process of choosing a change program in the following major steps:

Identifying the area of an improvement program

Determining needs for improvement in the area of concern

Surveying resources available to meet the needs

Assessing local factors favoring or opposing the adoption of different promising resources

Arriving at the choice of an improvement program based on the steps above

Unit 9. Analyzing and Improving the Implementation of a Local Educational Program. Often the specialist in local educational improvement will have the task of improving a school or school system program rather than of helping introduce a new program. This unit focuses on this process and covers the following:

Identifying specific aims of the program to be improved, and program features related to those aims

Assessing shortcomings in implementation of the program's features

Identifying likely causes for shortcomings in program implementation

Designing a plan for improving the implementation of the program

Exercises in the unit give the student practice in planning to perform these aspects of the unit task.

Unit 10. Diffusing Educational Improvement Programs within a School System. Many times, improvement programs that are successful in the pilot tryout in a few classrooms or in one or two schools fail to spread throughout the school district. This unit examines reasons why this is so and analyzes ways in which system-wide adoption of improvement programs can occur. These are some of the topics covered:

Distinguish needs for improvement that are apt to be system-wide from those that are apt to be localized within a school district

Identify reasons why a successful pilot program may fail to spread throughout the district

Indicate occasions when an improvement program should be initiated system-wide and those when a pilot tryout is needed

When is it desirable to foster the system-wide adoption of a theme rather than of specific improvement programs?

What advantages and disadvantages are there apt to be in a system-made improvement program rather than one developed outside the system?

Preparing an outline for diffusing an improvement program, system-wide.

Filling out the Personal Unit Analysis Form

When you have finished examining the unit descriptions it is time to react to each unit on the Personal Unit Analysis Form (next page). In doing this, take one unit at a time, rereading the unit description, then filling in the boxes on the analysis form opposite the unit title.

Your ratings of the amount of training (or course work) and work experience you have had with the unit topic come first. Is the unit topic one you know a great deal about, or is it relatively unfamiliar?

Next, give your judgment of the importance of the topic for your present job, or for jobs you'd like to hold. It is possible that all of the units will appear to you to be highly important; if so, do not hesitate to enter H for high opposite each unit.

Finally, for each unit, rate how strong your need is to study that unit. Again, even though you may not decide to study more than a small number of the units, you may want to indicate a high Need to Study most or all of them. After you have made your ratings opposite all of the units, it may be helpful for you to rank the units in terms of Need to Study, giving rank 1 to the unit you think you most need to study, and so on.

Your instructor, if you have one, can be very helpful to you in filling out Columns 3 and 4. Especially for jobs you have not held, your instructor can help you judge how important each unit will be for those jobs. Also, your instructor may recommend or require that you study certain units in relation to course work or a workshop.

Now, fill out the Personal Unit Analysis Form as a step toward deciding on your study plan as recorded on the Unit Study Plan Form.

PERSONAL UNIT ANALYSIS FORM

Directions: Fill in the boxes opposite each of the 9 unit titles. In column 1, 2, and 3, enter H (high), M (moderate), or L (low) to indicate the Training or Course Work you've had on that topic, the Work Experience you've had on the topic, and the Importance of Topic for Job(s), whether for the job you hold or jobs you'd like to hold. In column 4, fill in Need to Study the Unit as H, M, or L without regard to whether you may include the unit in your study plan.

UNIT TOPIC	COL. 1 TRAINING OR COURSE WORK ON TOPIC	COL. 2 WORK EXPERIENCE ON TOPIC	COL. 3 IMPORTANCE OF TOPIC FOR JOB(S)	COL. 4 NEED TO STUDY THE UNIT
2. Theory and Strategies of Improvement Programs				
3. Task Flow for Local Improvement Programs				
4. Individualization, Mastery, & Self-Direction as Themes				
5. Enquiry as an Instructional Theme				
6. Personal/Social Development as an Instructional Theme				
7. Relevance as an Instructional Theme				
8. Choosing a Local Improvement Program				
9. Improving Implementation of a Local Program				
10. Diffusing a Successful Program, System-Wide				

Filling out the Unit Study Plan Form

Your final planning task is to decide which of the nine units you will study, and how you will study them. The Unit Study Plan Form will help you do this.

First, on the Form, (next page) fill in your reasons for studying units of this training program. Be as specific as you can. If you are studying the units as part of your course work, or in a workshop, indicate what course or workshop and what use will be made of the training units. If you study the units on a personal basis, give your reasons for studying them.

Next, indicate the approximate amount of time you have for study of units in the program; this may limit the number of units you will study among those you rated as HIGH Need to Study on the Personal Unit Analysis Form. Indicate also the period of time over which your study will take place.

Now comes the critical decision in your planning: Which units will you study? You might, for example, want to focus on Units 2 and 3 in order to increase your understanding and competencies in the overall process of planning and conducting local improvement programs. Or you might want to focus on one or more of Units 4-7 that deal with themes of educational reform. Or, if you are especially interested in individualization (for example) and want to be able to foster this theme in local improvement programs, you might select Units 3 (the Task Flow) and 4 (Individualization, Mastery, and Student Self-Direction). Your instructor, if you have one, doubtless will assist you in selecting units for study.

Finally, fill out the bottom section of the Unit Study Plan Form to indicate how you will study the units you select.

UNIT STUDY PLAN FORM

Directions: Outline your plan for studying units in this training program by filling out the sections of this form. Be as specific as you can in describing your study plan. (You may wish to return once more to the descriptions).

YOUR REASONS FOR STUDYING UNITS OF THIS PROGRAM

University Course Work. Specify: _____

_____

_____

Workshop or In-service Course. Specify: _____

_____

_____

Personal Reasons Only. Specify: _____

_____

_____

AMOUNT OF TIME YOU HAVE FOR STUDY OF THE PROGRAM

Figure your time in terms of full-day equivalents, whether you study during the daytime, evenings, or weekends. Figure 6 hours of study is a full day's work.

Number of days _____. Over what time period? From _____

To _____

UNITS YOU PLAN TO STUDY

Depending on your purposes and the time available, you may study any number from one to all nine of the units. Figure that the units each require from one to two days of study.

Units to be studied: (Circle the numbers) 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

HOW YOU PLAN TO STUDY THE UNITS

On a contract basis with instructor. Specify: _____

_____

_____

With fellow students. Specify: _____

_____

_____

On a fully independent basis. Specify: _____

_____

_____